

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 09/986,254	Applicant(s) TOMITA, MAKOTO	
	Examiner Mark R. Milia	Art Unit 2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark R. Milia. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) John D. Magluyan. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 14 December 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Schwartz and Sampath.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the combination of Schwartz and Sampath in regards to claims 1, 8, and 15, particularly the limitations of setting evaluation information, displaying an evaluation screen for querying evaluation of printing speed, and updating the selection criterion for determining said operation mode based on the evaluation result acquired in said evaluation acquisition step. Examiner explained that Schwartz suggests the need to evaluate the printing strategy as the reference states that "the driver's prediction will never be 100% accurate, so the user is given the opportunity to substitute his own selection" and Schwartz also suggests updating the strategy based on previous results, as the reference states "Data transmission rate is estimated based on... Transfer rate observed in real-time by the driver on previous print jobs". The examiner also explained that the reference of Sampath was used to show that it would have been obvious to incorporate setting evaluation information and displaying an evaluation screen to a user and acquiring a result into the system of Schwartz. The applicant's attorney asked if anything could be added to the claim language that would overcome the current rejection. The examiner agreed to review the specification for any potential allowable subject that could be added to the claims.